



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VROEG'S CATALOGUE.

BY WITMER STONE.

IN the Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections Vol. 47, pp. 332-347, were published a reprint of the "Adumbratiunculæ" of Vroeg's Catalogue 1764, by Mr. C. Davies Sherborn and comments on the new birds described therein, by Dr. Charles W. Richmond.

It is shown that P. S. Pallas was undoubtedly the author of the Adumbratiunculæ and that many of the new names proposed, antedate those now in use.

Two protests have since appeared, against the adoption of these names as advocated by Dr. Richmond.

Dr. P. L. Sclater (Ibis, 1905, p. 490-491) rejects the names because Vroeg's Catalogue appeared before (by a *lapsus calami* he says after) the twelfth edition of Linnæus, with which edition Dr. Sclater begins his nomenclature. He adds however "There is no proof whatever that the 'Adumbratiunculæ' were published at all; they are paged separately from the 'Sale-list.' All we know is that a printed copy of them is attached to Linnæus's copy of the Sale-list, and it was probably sent to Linnæus by Pallas. But it is impossible to say whether the 'Adumbratiunculæ' were issued along with other copies of the Sale-list or were intended by the author for Linnæus's private use only."

Dr. Sclater's position is of course unassailable if we begin our nomenclature with the twelfth edition of Linnæus, but those zoologists who follow this practice are a rapidly decreasing minority and most of us cannot dismiss Vroeg's catalogue so easily. His claim that it is impossible to say whether the Adumbratiunculæ were really published or were attached to other copies of the Catalogue would probably not have been made had he read the statement in the preface relative to them, which is quoted below. Furthermore since Mr. Sherborn and Dr. Richmond published their reprint and commentary, two more copies of the Catalogue have turned up, each with the Adumbratiunculæ attached. One as explained below is in the Zoological Society of Amsterdam, while the other was procured a few years since by Dr. Charles W. Rich-

mond from a dealer in the same city. To Dr. Richmond's liberality I am indebted for the privilege of examining his copy of this rare work.

The second protest against accepting the names in question is by Dr. E. D. Van Oort who discovered a copy of Vroeg's Catalogue in the library of the Royal Zoological Society "Natura Artis Magistra" at Amsterdam and describes it in Notes from the Leyden Museum XXXIV No. 1, pp. 66-69. Dec. 1, 1911.

Dr. Van Oort states that "all the new species of the "adumbratiunculæ" are mentioned, most of them under the same latin names, some under other latin names" in the Catalogue proper which precedes the *Adumbratiunculæ* and the names in the latter are thus preoccupied by those in the Catalogue.

"These latter names however, cannot be considered because the author of the names and of the descriptions is unknown."

He adds that even if this were not the case the *Adumbratiunculæ* were anonymous when published and the quotations of Linnæus and Pallas citing the latter as the author do not affect the case.

The latter contention I do not think will be seriously considered as the evidence of Pallas' authorship is perfectly clear. The former contention is distinctly illogical because if the names of the Catalogue are denied recognition in scientific nomenclature they certainly have no status whatever and cannot preclude the subsequent use of the same names, either in the same or another connection.

Since the American Ornithologists' Union Code of Nomenclature does not reject anonymous names, I should be willing to accept the new names which appear in the Catalogue proper and quote them from there rather than from the *Adumbratiunculæ* if there were no other question involved. There is however, a serious question as to whether the Catalogue is strictly binomial or was even intended to be.

The author states in the preface that the species are arranged under the Linnæan genera and are numbered to correspond with the tenth edition of the *Systema Natura*, while such species as were not contained in this work are marked with a zero. He further says "Ce qui nous a engagé à en donner des descriptions détaillées à la fin du Catalogue, qui pourront servir à ceux qui se

font un étude methodique de l'Histoire Naturelle." This of course refers to the *Adumbratiunculæ* of Pallas.

The author of the Catalogue evidently used Pallas's names for the nondescripts just as he used Linnæan's names for species already known, but he added miscellaneous explanatory terms indicating sex, age, and condition as well as additional descriptive words, until the result seems to me anything but consistent binomialism. In fact the author probably never meant his names to be so considered, since he refers distinctly to the appended *Adumbratiunculæ* as provided for those interested in the systematic study of Natural History.

The following quotation will show how the technical names are given in the Catalogue. The genera are usually cited in the plural, and the specific names given in parentheses.

- | | | |
|------------------|---|-----------|
| ANATES
EENDEN | } | Genus LXI |
|------------------|---|-----------|
- 238 BERG EEND. *Mannetje* (*Tadorna Mas*) Lin. Sp. 3
 239 ZWARTE ZEE EEND (*Nigra*) Lin. Sp. 6
 240 STORM EEND (*Fusca*) Lin. Sp. 5
 241 *Idem't Wyfje* (*Praecedentis Femina*)
 242 MAKHOVSEY OF TURKSCH EEND *Mannetje* (*Moschata Mas*)
 Lin. Sp. 13
 243 *Idem het KIEKEN* (*Pullus Moschatae*)
 * * * * *
- 256 KOL OF STEEN GANS (*Anser*) Lin. Sp. 7.
 257 GROENLANDSCHE BRAND GANS. *Mannetje*. (*Anser Bernicla*
 s. Brenta Mas) Lin. Sp. 11.
 258 TARTARYSCHE GANS *Mannetje*. (*Anser Tartaricus ferrugineus*
 Mas) Lin. Sp. 0.

Should anyone still consider that the names in the Catalogue should be recognized he will find seven which differ from those proposed in the *Adumbratiunculæ*, viz.

Adumbratiunculæ	Catalogue
No. 59* [= 57*] <i>Certhia collaris</i>	= <i>Certhia torque rubra</i> p. 8
113 <i>Loxia tricolor</i>	= <i>Loxia erythromelana</i> p. 13
114-115 <i>Lanius carbo</i>	= <i>Lanius purpureus</i> p. 13
142 <i>Fringilla citrinella</i>	= <i>Fringilla Canariæ subsimilis</i> p. 15
175 (not named)	= <i>Parus aureus</i> p. 18

- 358 [= 258] *Anser ferruginea* = *Anser Tartaricus ferrugineus* p. 25
 320 *Trynga alba* = *Tringa Leucophæa* p. 32

Unfortunately Dr. Richmond has adopted *Parus aureus* from the Catalogue, and the committee of the American Ornithologists' Union adopted *Tringa leucophæa*. If these names are rejected as I think they must be then *Euphonia aurea* (Pallas) p. 345 of Dr. Richmond's paper will revert to *Euphonia chlorotica* Linn. 1766; while the Sanderling will be known as *Calidris alba* Pallas as given by Dr. Richmond, p. 347.

I can see no excuse whatever for rejecting the names given in the *Adumbratiunculæ* and the changes in nomenclature suggested by Dr. Richmond should be adopted.

Moreover one more seems to be necessary. The Crested Guinea Fowl, *Guttera cristata* usually quoted from *Numida cristata* Pallas Spic. Zool. I, p. 15, 1767, is described in the *Adumbratiunculæ* 1764 as *Meleagris cristata*. This name however is invalidated by *Meleagris cristata* Linn., Syst. Nat. 1758, and I would therefore propose for *Meleagris cristata* Pallas 1764 (= *Numida cristata* Pallas 1767) the name ***Guttera pallasii***.



GREAT AUK EGGS IN THE THAYER MUSEUM.

BY JOHN E. THAYER.

Plate XII.

THERE is at the present time a series of eight eggs of the Great Auk, *Plautus impennis*, in my collection. Three of these were described in 'The Auk' for 1905. The others are those numbered XIV to XVIII in Thomas Parkin's Catalogue of mounted skins and eggs of the Great Auk sold at public auction in Great Britain 1806-1910, from which publication the following notes are taken.

Egg XIV was found in the shop of Mons. Perrot, Naturalist Preparateur at the Museum of Natural History in Paris, by the late